POLITICS, JUDGES, STATE'S ATTORNEYS AND GRAND JURIES IN A HIGH MIX

Over the Investigation of Alleged Frauds in the Election of a State's Attorney—It Is Largely a Newspaper and Political Fight—The Public Interest.

BY N. D. COCHRAN

I have been reading everything published by all of the newspapers concerning judges, state's attorneys and grand juries in connection with a proposed investigation of election frauds last fall, when on the face of the returns, Maclay Hoyne was elected state's attorney over Rinnaker, Republican; Cunnea, Socialist, and Haight, Progressive.

Knowing none of the interested persons, I was trying to find where the public interest was—the interest of the average man who doesn't make his living out of politics, but who is vitally interested in honest elections.

As the public necessarily gets its information from the newspapers, I have been analyzing their attitude. It appears primarily to be a newspaper fight, even the political side being subordinate to that.

On the one side are the Hearst papers—The American and Examiner—and on the other side, all the other trust newspapers.

As Hoyne was Andy Lawrence's candidate and has apparenly played the Hearst game since he went into office, the Hearst papers are battling for him, and the other papers against him.

When the regular grand jury, with State's Attorney Hoyne in charge, was impanelled in Judge Cooper's court, the judge instructed the jury to investigate election frauds. For some reason or other grand juries in Cook county appear to investigate only what the state's attorney brings before them; and when this grand jury had been kept busy by Hoyne investigating a faked-up "crime trust," which dwindled down to a few clairvoyants, it reported on adjournment that no evidence about election frauds was submitted to it.

My own opinion is that Hoyne and the Hearst papers worked up the